a card between the two eyes, and causing a slight convergence of the eyes, the two images are brought upon corresponding points of the two retinæ, the image will at once be seen in relief.

Consult regarding the physiology of the eye, as the most complete treatise on the subject, Helmholtz's *Optique Physiologique*, 1867; one of the best of the older treatises is Mackenzie *On the Eye and Vision*, 1841; in the first-mentioned treatise, a full list is given at the end of each section of all the more important works and monographs bearing on the physiology and optical arrangements of the eye, up to 1867. A very valuable bibliographical account is one recently published by J. Plateau, entitled *Bibliographie analytique des principaux phénomènes subjective de la Vision depuis les temps anciens jusqu'à la fin du XVIIIe siècle, suivie d'une bibliographie simple pour la partie écoulée du siècle actuel: extrait du tome xlii. des Mémoires de l'Académie royale des sciences, des lettres, et des beaux-arts de Belgique*, 1877. (J. G. M.)

EZEKIEL (יְחֶזְקֵאל, *i.e.*, יְחַזֵּק אֵל, God will strengthen, or יְחֱזַק אֵל, God will prevail; Ἰεζεκιήλ; *Ezechiel*) was the son of Buzi a priest, probably of the line of Zadok, who appears to have lived in Jerusalem, and to have held a position of some prominence there. According to an ancient and not impossible interpretation of his own words (chap. i. 1), Ezekiel was born in 624 B.C. This interpretation is at least preferable to that which reckons "the thirtieth year" from a hypothetical era of Nabopolassar; but it is not free from all objection, and if it fail us we have no data for precisely determining the prophet's age. Notwithstanding the express use made by Josephus (παῖς ὤν, *Ant.*, x. 7, 3) we may reasonably assume, however, that he had at least attained to early manhood, and already had read and observed much, when, along with King Jehoiachin and many other prisoners of the better class (2 Kings xxiv. 12–16; Jer. xxix. 1) he was carried into exile by Nebuchadnezzar in 599 B.C. With others of his compatriots he was settled at a place called Tel-Abib ("Corn-hill"), on the banks of the river Chebar, by which most probably the Nahr-Malcha or "Grand" Canal of Nebuchadnezzar is meant, though some still think of the Chaboras (modern Khabur), an affluent of the Euphrates more to the north.[1] We are left almost wholly to precarious inference and conjecture for all further details of his history. We learn incidentally, indeed, from his writings that he was a married man living in a house of his own, and that his wife died in the ninth year of his exile. But of the nature of his ordinary employments, if he had any, we are not informed. His life, as a priest whose heart was thoroughly absorbed in priestly work, could hardly fail to be tinged with sadness, condemned as it was to be spent in an "unclean land" far away from "the inheritance of the Lord." He seems to have been of a brooding temperament, and to have passed much of his time in silence and solitude. A recent writer (in the *Studien u. Kritiken* for 1877) has ingeniously suggested and endeavoured to show that he was an invalid, suffering much from some chronic nervous malady. In the fifth year of his exile (594 B.C.) he had a remarkable vision, of which he has given a very full description in the opening chapters of his book. On this occasion he was divinely called to the prophetic office. Thenceforward, for a period of at least 22 years, both orally and in writing, he continued to discharge prophetic functions at frequent if somewhat irregular intervals; and whatever may have been the force and bitterness of the opposition he originally had to face, he ultimately, as a "watchman" and acknowledged leader of public opinion, came to exercise an incalculably powerful influence in keeping alive the Jewish national feeling, and also in quickening and purifying the religious hopes and aspirations of his time. The last date mentioned in his writings is the 27th year of his exile (572 B.C.). It is not probable that he lived long after that time. Nothing authentic, however, has been handed down to us as to the time, place, or manner of his death. Several unimportant traditions may be found in the work of the Pseudo-Epiphanius, *De vit. et mort. proph.*, in the *Itinerary* of Benjamin of Tudela, and elsewhere.

In the present Massoretic canon the book of Ezekiel stands third in order among those of the so-called Nebî'îm Aharônîm (latter prophets), being preceded by those of Isaiah and Jeremiah, and followed by that of the twelve minor prophets. In the list of canonical books given in the Talmud (*Baba bathra*, 14, 2) it is the second of the four, being followed by "Isaiah" and "the twelve." Its arrangement is unusually simple, the chronological corresponding for the most part with the natural order. Its three divisions date respectively from before, during, and after the siege of Jerusalem.

1. The first 24 chapters carry the reader from the time of the prophet's consecration down to the beginning of the siege of Jerusalem, *i.e.*, from 594 to 590 B.C. They are made up of some 29 distinct oracles, all of which, with the trifling exception of xxi. 33–37 [28–32], have direct reference to the religious and political condition of Ezekiel's compatriots in Babylonia and in Palestine. First in order stands the famous "chariot" (comp. 1 Ch. xxviii. 18) vision, which has been so variously estimated, both from the æsthetic and from the theological point of view, by different critics. Rightly interpreted, as a mere description, it cannot justly be called vague or obscure, and it is hard to account for the strange stories told of the difficulties felt by the Jews in expounding it. The prophet sees in a storm-cloud coming out of the north a group of four living creatures (cherubs), each with four wings and four different faces. Together they are borne upon four wheels which are full of eyes. Resting upon their heads is a firmament, supporting a sapphire throne, whereon is seated a man-like figure, which is almost hidden in a blaze of light. Hereupon Ezekiel receives and eats the bitter-sweet roll in which are written "lamentations and mourning and woe;" he is now ready to go forth to his fellow-countrymen fearlessly declaring the truth as it is revealed to him, however unwelcome it may be. The recorded oracles that follow belong to the fifth, sixth, seventh, and ninth years of his exile. They can be understood only when viewed in connexion with the general history of that period. Soon after his accession to the throne, Zedekiah, the uncle and successor of Jehoiachin, had begun to intrigue against his suzerain the king of Babylon, and had entered into secret relations with the king of Egypt. Ezekiel, like his older contemporary Jeremiah, had insight and sagacity enough to see the unwisdom of such a policy. By various symbolical actions (iv. 1–8; iv. 9–17; v. 1–4; vi. 11; xii. 1–16; xxi. 11 [6]), and also by unequivocal words, he repeatedly declared the certainty of the doom that was impending over Jerusalem, Judah, and all the mountains of Israel; he insisted on the uselessness of any struggle against Babylon, and distinctly predicted Zedekiah's captivity, blindness, and death. In language of the severest invective he rebuked the sins and idolatries, worse than those of Sodom, which had brought this inevitable ruin upon the land and people of the Lord; at the same time he held forth the hope of ultimate restoration and final happiness for both Judah and Ephraim at the end of "forty years," under the guidance of the coming prince "whose right it is" (chaps. xi. 14–21; xvii. 22–24; xx. 40–44; xxi. 32 [27]).

[1] Bleek (*Einl.* § 221, note) is probably wrong in identifying both כְּבָר and Chaboras with the חָבוֹר of 2 Kings xvii. 6, which is most probably the Khabur, a tributary of the Tigris (Delitzsch, *Jesaja*, p. 16, note).

2. The eight chapters which follow (xxv.–xxxii.) belong to the period which elapsed between the beginning of the siege and the announcement of the capture of Jerusalem; xxix. 17–21 is an exception, belonging to the 27th year of the prophet's exile, and perhaps also chap. xxv., which has no date. During this period the prophet had no word to speak concerning Judah and Israel.[1] In these chapters the divine woe is pronounced against the seven neighbouring nations which had shown most hostility to Judah and Israel, namely, Ammon, Moab, Edom, Philistia, Tyre, Sidon, and Egypt. The oracles relating to Tyre and Egypt are of great length. The others are comparatively brief. With regard to Tyre its capture and ruin by Nebuchadnezzar are foretold; and it is predicted that within a very short time Egypt shall be desolate forty years. The addition (xxix. 17–21) made seventeen years afterwards is apparently due to the fact that the earlier prediction regarding Tyre (xxvi. 7–14) had not been literally fulfilled. This section contains several passages that are specially interesting from a literary point of view. The description of the great merchant city in chap. xxvii. is noticeable for the richness of its details, and also for the vigour with which the comparison to a ship is carried out in ver. 5–9, 26–36. Striking also is the dirge (chap. xxviii. 12-19) upon the king: "Thou deftly made signet-ring, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty—thou hast been in Eden, the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, the topaz, and the diamond. . . . Beside the overshadowing cherub did I place thee; thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou walkedst up and down in the midst of stones of fire. Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee. By the multitude of thy merchandise they have filled the midst of thee with violence, and thou hast sinned; therefore I will cast thee as profane out of the mountain of God, and the overshadowing cherub shall destroy thee from the midst of the stones of fire." As Tyre had been likened to a ship, so is Egypt with great minuteness of detail likened to a cedar in chap. xxxi. In chap. xxxii. follows a corresponding dirge, in which the assembled nations are represented as mourning women singing their lament over Egypt's grave.

3. The remainder of the book (xxxiii.–xlviii.) dates from after the fall of Jerusalem. In chap. xxxiii. we read how the prophet's dumbness was taken away in the twelfth (more probably the eleventh[2]) year of his exile, on the day when tidings were brought of the ruin of the city. Thereupon chap. xxxiv. opens with a brief retrospect, in which the former avarice, idleness, and cruelty of Israel's shepherds which have led to such disaster are exposed and rebuked. But the future—the immediate and the distant—chiefly occupies the prophet's mind. He tells of a coming shepherd, "David," under whose rule great and uninterrupted prosperity is to be secured. Edom is to be finally destroyed, but the twelve tribes are to be resuscitated and gathered together in their own land once more. A final battle has yet to be fought with Gog from the land of Magog, who shall come up against the chosen people with a great army, but only to be utterly destroyed, that Israel may thenceforward dwell in safety, wholly secure from any possible repetition of former calamities. Then follow in detail the final arrangements of the reorganized theocracy. The new temple, its dimensions, construction, furniture, are described; new laws as to sacrifice and festival are given for the priests, prince, and people of the new commonwealth. Directions are given for the equitable partition of the Holy Land among the twelve tribes, and for the building of the new city, which is to be called by the new name Jahveh Shammah, "the Lord is there." In all these regulations a general formal resemblance to the Pentateuchal legislation is abundantly manifest; but the differences of detail are no less striking. The following may be mentioned among others. Ezekiel's temple is larger, but simpler, than that of Solomon. The distinction between the Holy and the Most Holy Place is much less marked. Both ark and high-priest are passed over in silence. The priesthood is specifically Zadokite. The "prince" has priestly functions assigned him. The morning burnt-offering is brought into special prominence; of the great festivals, the passover and the feast of tabernacles alone are noticed. The feast of pentecost is omitted, nor is any mention made of the great day of atonement, but an observance unknown in the Pentateuch, on the 1st and 7th of the first month, is proposed instead.

The genuineness of the book of Ezekiel has seldom been questioned. Some perplexity has been caused by the statement in the Talmud (*Baba bathra* 15, 1) that the men of the great synagogue "wrote" Ezekiel. This obscure expression, by which most probably mere editing was meant, has been deprived of some of its importance by Kuenen's demonstration of the unhistorical character of the entire tradition regarding the great synagogue. Towards the close of last century some doubts were expressed by Oeder, Vogel, and an anonymous English writer in the *Monthly Magazine* (1798), with regard to the genuineness of the last nine chapters, which were supposed rather to be of a Samaritan origin, and by Corodi with respect also to chaps. xxxviii. and xxxix.; but these doubts were unanimously set aside by the not too conservative critics of that period. Zunz (*Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, 1832; also *Gesammelte Schriften*, i. 217 *f.*, 1875) was the first to impugn the genuineness of the entire work, his thesis, in its most recent form, being that no such prophet as Ezekiel ever existed, and that the present work bearing that fictitious name was written somewhere between the years 440 and 400 B.C. His arguments are partly of the *a priori* kind, such as that the special predictions contained in it (xvii. 16, xxiv. 2, 16, &c.) are inconsistent with the genuineness of the book, and that it is inconceivable that in 570 B.C. any prophet could ever have thought of suggesting a new division of the Holy Land, or of drafting a new law-book, or of sketching the plans of a new temple and city. He argues further from the silence of other scriptures, particularly of Jeremiah and of the book of Ezra, with regard to Ezekiel; from certain allusions in the book itself, such as those to Daniel, to the wine of Halybon, &c.; also from its grammatical and linguistic peculiarities. There is still practical unanimity, nevertheless, among critics of all schools in the opinion that the stamp of Ezekiel's individuality is unmistakably and even obtrusively visible in every page of the book that bears his name. Keil and Kuenen agree in holding him to have been its author, and its editor as well. He is believed indeed not to have reduced it to its present form till near the close of his life; and many have embraced the opinion of Ewald, that the earlier dates have in some cases been incorrectly given by him. The text, it ought to be remembered, however, has reached us in a somewhat impure state.

The question principally discussed in recent years, and likely to be discussed for some time to come, in connexion with Ezekiel's name is not whether he wrote less than tradition has assigned to him, but rather whether he may

[1] The language of xxiv. 27, taken along with that of xxxiii. 22, has led many to the conclusion that Ezekiel was literally dumb during this period, and that the oracles belonging to it must necessarily have been written, not spoken. But xxix. 21, dating from a much later period, requires to be also considered in this connexion. He may possibly have been speechless on certain subjects only.

[2] So the Peshito and a few of the MSS. See Ewald, Hitzig, Bleek.

not possibly have written more. In connexion with his theory of the late origin of the priestly legislation in the Pentateuch, Graf, in 1866, arguing from admitted similarities of style, gave it out as his belief that Ezekiel was the author of certain chapters of Leviticus (xviii.–xxiii., xxv., xxvi.). This view, which in substance has subsequently been adopted by Colenso and a few others, is manifestly one which does not admit of anything like demonstration. On the other hand, the larger and more interesting inquiry as to the relative priority of the Levitical and Deuteronomic legislations does not fall to be discussed in this place (see PENTATEUCH).

It remains that something should be said of Ezekiel's place as an author and as a religious teacher. His work may be judged from the purely literary point of view more fairly perhaps than that of any of the earlier prophets,—for, unlike them, he was a writer much more than he was a preacher. His oracles were sometimes written before they were spoken; sometimes he wrote what he had no intention of speaking at all. He may be called one of the first sopherim or scribes, if we use that word in its higher sense as denoting "bookmen," and not mere readers or copyists. As a leader of public opinion, he handled a variety of subjects in a corresponding variety of styles, but always with a manner entirely his own. His prose is invariably simple and unaffected; if there be any obscurity at all, it is really caused by his excessive desire to make it impossible for his reader to misunderstand him. His poetry has suffered much at the hands of translators, and the student who is wholly dependent on our Authorized Version will be often at a loss to understand the comparisons to Æschylus, Dante, or Milton which have occasionally been suggested. More than that of any other prophet, it has been subjected to the extremes of exaggerated praise and undue depreciation by its critics. The sympathetic modern reader, however, will be able to find in it a sublimity, a tenderness, a beauty, a melody, wholly peculiar to itself. Chapter xix., which even Schrader pronounces "masterly," may be specially referred to; also chapters xxviii. and xxxii.

As a religious teacher, it is natural to compare Ezekiel with Jeremiah, his older contemporary, on the one hand, and with his immediate successor, the author of Isa. xl.–lxvi., on the other. It has frequently been said (most strongly perhaps by Duhm) that the contrast is very great, and very much to the disadvantage of Ezekiel. The three men, nevertheless, have much that is common to them all If Ezekiel sometimes (and especially in his closing chapters) shows a preponderating externalism, a tendency to delight in the fulness and minuteness of his ceremonial details, it must not be forgotten that Jeremiah too looked forward to a restored sanctuary and a reorganized priesthood as essential elements in the perfected theocracy of the future. And if the "Great Unnamed" be justly regarded as one of the loftiest and purest exponents of the spiritual religion of coming days, we must at the same time remember that Ezekiel too had bidden men seek above all things that city, open only to the pure in heart, of which the glory is that "the Lord is there."

Ezekiel is nowhere mentioned by name in the New Testament, and the direct traces of his writings there, apart from those in the Apocalypse, are comparatively few. Matt. vii. 24–27 compared with Ezek. xiii. 10–13, and John x. 16 compared with Ezek. xxxiv. 22, 23, may be referred to Both directly, however, and also through the writer of the Apocalypse, his influence upon Christian thought, and especially upon Christian eschatology, has been considerable.

Literature.—For the ancient, mediæval, and earlier modern commentaries, see Carpzow and other works of introduction. The most important works of recent date are those of Ewald, *Die Propheten des alten Bundes*, vol. ii. 2nd. ed., 1868, Engl. tr. 1877; Hävernick, *Commentar ü. d. Proph. Ezechiel*, 1843; Hitzig, *D. Proph. Ezechiel*, 1847; Fairbairn, *Exposition of the Book of Ezekiel*, 1851; Kliefoth, *D. Buch Ezechiels*, 1865; Hengstenberg, *D. Weissagungen d. Pr. Ezechiels*, 1867; Keil, *D. Proph. Ezechiel*, 1868; *The Speaker's Commentary*, vol. vi., 1876. See also Ewald's *Geschichte d. V. Isr.*, iv. 18 ff.; Kuenen, *Godsdienst van Israel*, vol. ii., and *Profeten en Profetie*, 1875, Eng. tr. 1877; Schrader's article "Ezekiel" in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon*; Duhm, *Die Theologie der Propheten*, 1875. On the critical questions see Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, p. 157–299, and *Gesammelte Schriften*, 1875; Graf, *D. geschichtliche Bücher des A. B.* 1866; Kuenen, in *Theol. Tijdschrift* for Sept. 1870; Colenso, *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined*, part vi., 1872; Klostermann on "Ezekiel" in the *Studien u. Kritiken* for 1877. The English reader may be referred to *The Holy Bible with various renderings and readings*, London, 1876. Bunsen's *Bibelwerk* will also be found useful by the ordinary reader of German. (J. S. BL.)

EZRA (עֶזְרָא *i.e.*, help; Ἔσδρας; *Esdras*), the famous scribe, was a priest of the line of Zadok. According to the genealogy given in Ezra vii. 1–5, his father's name was Seraiah. If we identify this Seraiah with the person mentioned in Ezra ii. 2, Neh. xii. 1, then the Ezra who is the subject of the present article may well be identified, as has been done by Michaelis and others, with the Ezra named in the last-quoted texts; and in this case he must have been a very old man even at the beginning of that public work with which his name is chiefly associated. But a careful comparison of the genealogy in 1 Ch. vi. 4–15 with that in Ezra vii. leads rather to the conclusion that the latter has most probably been abridged, so far as the more immediate and less eminent ancestors of our Ezra are concerned. They are omitted probably because, though closely connected with Joshua, the son of Josadak, they did not avail themselves of the permission, granted by Cyrus, to return to Jerusalem in 536. They do not seem on that account, however, to have lost much, if any, of the social influence to which their high rank in the priesthood entitled them. Josephus tells us, somewhat mysteriously, that Ezra himself was high-priest of the Jews who were left in Babylon. Be this as it may, we know that when he first appears in history, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus (458 B.C.), he is already a man of great learning, zeal, and authority, enjoying the confidence, not only of his own compatriots, but also of the Persian king. It is to be regretted that we should so imperfectly know what was the true condition of the Jews in Babylon during the years that immediately followed the close of the "exile." We have various indications, however, that many of them devoted themselves to the study of the written law, kept up friendly intercourse with their compatriots in Jerusalem, regularly sent free-will offerings to the temple there (Philo, *Ad Caium*, 1013), and made occasional pilgrimages thither (Zech. vi. 9). In Judea, on the other hand, the fifty-eight years between 516 and 458, which are passed over in silence in the history, do not seem to have been more prosperous than the twenty preceding years of which the record has been preserved. Whether influenced by unfavourable reports of the condition of affairs at Jerusalem, or proceeding upon knowledge personally obtained in some previous visit, Ezra, who had "been directing his heart to seek the law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments," asked and received in the above-mentioned year the royal authority to make an official visit to Judea. From the terms of his commission, which are given in Ezra vii. 12–26, we learn that very considerable powers and privileges were at that time conferred upon him. On the first day of the first month of the Jewish year he set out on his westward journey, carrying with him many valuable offerings, and accompanied by some 1500 of his fellow-countrymen. The first considerable halt was made at "the river of Ahava," a locality which has not been identified as yet (it is called Theras in 1 Esdras viii. 41)[1], and here it was found that no Levites had joined the expedition. A message was accordingly sent to a place (now unknown) called Casiphia, where a large colony of them had settled, inviting their assistance. A considerable number of Levites were thus induced to join the party. A fast was thereafter appointed, the sacred treasures were solemnly entrusted to the keeping of twelve priests and twelve Levites (see Bertheau on Ezra viii. 24), and, deliberately dispensing with the usual military escort, the caravan set out on the twelfth day of the first month, arriving in Jerusalem on the first of the fifth. Here, in the course of the investigation which he had been commissioned to make, Ezra very soon found a field for his reforming activities. He learned that the population generally, priests, Levites, and rulers not excepted, had been intermarrying with the surrounding peoples to an extent which seemed to threaten the subversion of the true religion, and the obliteration of the Jewish nationality. The unexpected discovery filled him with amazement and shame. Soon a large number of the inhabitants came to him, and, with Shechaniah for spokesman, assured him that the people at large were willing to dismiss their foreign wives with their children, if only he would take in hand the direction of the matter. With all convenient speed a solemn assembly of all Judah and Jerusalem was then convened, at which, after Ezra had pointed out to the people their transgressions, it was agreed, with only a few dissentient voices (Ezra x. 15, where for "were employed in" read "stood up against"), to appoint a committee to inquire into and decide on all the cases of mixed marriage. This committee had finished its work by the beginning of the following year, when a complete list was drawn up of those who had "taken strange wives" and now pledged themselves to put them away. Thus far the Scripture narrative has carried us; but at this point, after detailing the events of precisely one year of Ezra's public life, it abruptly breaks off; nor do we read of him again for the next thirteen years. Modern writers are by no means at one in the conjectures they make as to what occurred during the interval. Ewald thinks that he remained in Jerusalem during all the intervening time; others (such as Kuenen) are of the opinion that he very soon left the city, and that during his absence occurred those relapses and disasters which were the occasion of his subsequent activities, and also of those of Nehemiah Hitzig thinks that he never reappeared at all, and corrects Nehemiah accordingly. According to the existing text, in the twentieth (twenty-first?) year of Artaxerxes, on the first day of the seventh month, we find him "in the open space that was before the watergate," solemnly reading, by public request, in the hearing of all the people, the "book of the law of Moses." One of the immediate effects of this fresh publication of the Mosaic law was that straightway the feast of tabernacles was observed as it had not been "since the days of Joshua the son of Nun;" and very soon afterwards a solemn fast was proclaimed, during which a written covenant was drawn up and confirmed by all the people, with Nehemiah at their head, by which they became bound "to walk in God's law which was given by Moses the servant of God," special prominence being given to the following points,—separation from the people of the land, strict observance of the Sabbath day and the sabbatic year, punctual payment of the third part of a shekel for the service of the temple, of the first fruits for the priests, and of the tithes for the Levites. And now, once more, after a second period of public activity, which in this case seems to have lasted for little more than a month, the name of Ezra abruptly disappears from the Scripture narrative. We have no authentic information from any source as to the events of his subsequent life, or as to the time, place, and manner of his death. According to Josephus, "he died an old man, and was buried in a magnificent manner at Jerusalem;" but several palpable blunders with reference to Ezra in other parts of this historian's narrative warn us to be cautious in receiving this statement. Other traditions relate that he died in Babylon, or at Zamzumu on the Tigris, while on a journey from Jerusalem to Susa. According to the best texts of the Apocryphal work known to English readers as 2 Esdras, he did not die at all, but was translated (xiv. 49).

Tradition is somewhat inconsistent with itself also in the account it gives of Ezra's relation to the Pentateuch. At one time it speaks of him as a mere copyist or transcriber; at another time it speaks of him as a voluminous author, a prophet, an independent legislator. Modern criticism in like manner has not as yet reached a unanimous finding on the position occupied by him with reference to previous oral and written enactments. While Ewald, on the one hand, maintains that the last editor of the Pentateuch lived when the kingdom of Judah was still standing, Graf and Kuenen, on the other hand, assign to Ezra a very large share in the production of that law-book as we now have it. Between the two extremes there is room for an intermediate view, akin to that of ecclesiastical tradition, which, without determining the extent of Ezra's work, admits that, having before him an earlier work, he added and perhaps also altered some things in an editorial capacity.

It cannot be doubted that Ezra was successful in at least giving to the law as written a prominence and an influence which it had never before possessed. Under him it became the exclusive rule of public and private life in a way that had never before been known. The rise of the order of "scribes," that is, of those whose business it was to know the law, to interpret it, and "make a hedge" round it, can be traced directly to him. If he thus was in a sense the founder of that pharisaism which in later ages degenerated into the well-known forms which were so abhorrent to Christ and to the spirit of Christianity, it ought to be remembered, on the other hand, that the synagogue services,—those assemblies throughout the towns and villages of the land in which the written word was weekly read and expounded with praise and prayer,—are most probably to be traced to his influence. The synagogue worship passed directly over from Judaism into the Christian church; and in this way Ezra, so far as he originated it, has exercised an incalculable influence on the religious culture of the race.

For much valuable information on the life and times of Ezra, and also for references to the older authorities, the histories of Israel by Ewald, Hitzig, Jost, Herzfeld, Graetz, and Kuenen may be consulted. See also Stanley's *Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church*, vol. iii. (J. S. BL.)

EZRA AND NEHEMIAH, BOOKS OF. The two canonical books entitled Ezra and Nehemiah in our English Bibles correspond to the 1 and 2 Esdras of the Vulgate, to the 2 Esdras and Nehemiah of the LXX., and to the Ezra and Nehemiah of the Massoretic text. Though for many centuries they have thus been treated as separate compositions, we have abundant evidence that they were anciently regarded as forming but one book. Thus, Origen (Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 25), expressly enumerating the twenty-two books of the old covenant as acknowledged by the Jews and accepted by the Christian church, gives as one of them Ἔσδρας πρῶτος καὶ δεύτερος ἐν ἑνὶ Ἐζρᾶ. Melito of Sardis (Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 26) in like manner mentions the book of Esdras only. So also the Talmud (in *Baba bathra*, 14, 2), nor can it be supposed that Josephus in his enumera-

[1] Hit, anciently called Ihi or Ihi-da-Kira, "the well-known spot where caravans make their plunge into the desert," has been suggested. Stanley, *Lectures on Jewish Church*, iii. 116. See p. 670 of the present volume (art. EUPHRATES).

tion (*C. Ap.* i. 8) reckoned Nehemiah as apart from Ezra. Some of the oldest copies of the LXX. make no division between 2 Esdras and Nehemiah; and that the Massoretes themselves recognized no real separation is shown by their epicrisis on Nehemiah.

If the external evidence for the unity of the book of Ezra-Nehemiah is strong, the internal evidence is decisive. As the result of long-continued careful examination, modern criticism, with practical unanimity (Hävernick and Keil are hardly exceptions), has reached the conclusion that Ezra and Nehemiah, so far from being separate compositions, together constitute but a section of a larger historical work, the origin, authorship, and plan of which have already been discussed in the article CHRONICLES, to which the reader is referred. Comparatively little remains to be said here on the special questions that arise in connexion with the Ezra-Nehemiah portion of the work.

Contents.—Resuming the abruptly broken off narrative of Chronicles, the first six chapters of Ezra relate how, in the first year of Cyrus king of Persia (537–6), Zerubbabel (called Sheshbazzar in chap. i.), along with Joshua and some 50,000 others who are enumerated according to their families, returned to Jerusalem, set up the altar of burnt-offering there, and in face of many difficulties and discouragements succeeded in rebuilding the temple, which was finally dedicated in the sixth year of Darius Hystaspis (516). An interval of fifty-eight years is then passed over in silence. The next chapters (Ezra vii.–x.) tell of Ezra's mission to Jerusalem in 458, and the dissolution of the heathen marriages there the one result of a period of eight months' activity. Another blank of thirteen years occurs in the history. Then we read (Neh. i. 1–vii. 73*a*) of Nehemiah's expedition to Jerusalem, of the difficulties he encountered on his arrival there (445–4), and how, notwithstanding all the opposition of the Samaritans, the building of the walls was successfully completed in fifty-two days. The list of those who had returned under Zerubbabel is given as in Ezra, chap. ii. The narrative then goes on to relate (Neh. vii. 73*b*–x. 39) how in the same year the law of Moses was anew promulgated by Ezra, being solemnly read by him in the presence of a national assembly; how the feast of the tabernacles was then observed with a strictness that had been unknown since the days of Joshua the son of Nun; and how a written covenant was drawn up and signed by which the people pledged themselves to observe the whole law. After some genealogies and other lists have been given (Neh. xi.–xii. 26), we next have an account of the ceremonial which took place at the dedication of the walls (440); also further particulars of arrangements for due support of the temple-worship, and of steps taken for the exclusion of aliens from the congregation of Israel. Finally, after an interval of not less than twelve years, we read of a second visit of Nehemiah to Jerusalem (probably in 432). This visit was the occasion of renewed efforts towards religious and social reformation. Special mention is made of a collision with Eliashib the high-priest, and also with Joiada his son, which resulted in the expulsion of the latter.

Authorship.—The abstract given above shows very clearly that Ezra-Nehemiah cannot claim to be a continuous chronicle of all the important events of the 110 years of Jewish history over which it extends. Indeed, of the 110 years only some twenty are referred to at all. This want of continuity cannot be attributed to lack of materials; but rather to the specific purpose by which the author was guided in the selection of his facts. That purpose manifestly was to give an account of the progress of the restored theocracy in Judah and Jerusalem, particularly in what related to the temple, and to the share of the priests and Levites in the temple-worship. The striking literary peculiarities which are here displayed in all that is not merely copied from earlier documents, and even in the manner in which these documents themselves are handled, all indicate one and the same author for Chronicles and for Ezra-Nehemiah.

Sources.—It lies open to the most superficial observation that the work of the Chronicler is a compilation derived from many sources. The authorities for this portion of it may be classified as follows: (1) Statistics derived from official records. The list contained in Ezra ii., and repeated with some variations in Neh. vii., may be taken as a specimen. It was already old in Nehemiah's day (Neh. vii. 5). The author mentions also a book of chronicles (*dibrê hajjâmîm*, Neh. xii. 23), from which the information in Neh. xii. 1–26 was derived. Neh. xi. 3–36 and 1 Ch. ix. 3–33 are also probably drawn from a common source of an official character. (2) A history of the building of the temple and of the obstacles that had to be overcome, written in Chaldee. This history seems to have furnished the section Ezra v. 1–vi. 18, and also to have been the source of the document given in Ezra iv. 8–23. (3) Ezra's personal memoirs. These have been directly transcribed in Ezra vii. 27–ix. 15; and they have been drawn upon for Ezra vii. 1–11, for chap. x., and also for Neh. vii. 73*b*–x. (4) Nehemiah's personal memoirs. These have been extracted from in Neh. i. 1–vii. 5, xi. 1, 2, xii. 31–42, xiii. 4–30, and they have been combined with those of Ezra in Neh. vii. 73*b*–x.

Date.—In the article CHRONICLES it has been shown that the genealogies there given (1 Ch. iii. 19 *sq.*), when fairly interpreted, must be taken as reckoning the descendants of Zerubbabel to six generations, thus bringing the history down to near the close of the Persian monarchy. In Ezra-Nehemiah all the indications of date which are given go to support the same conclusion. Neh. xii. 11, 22 brings the list of high-priests down to Jaddua, the contemporary of Alexander the Great. In verse 22 there is a reference, moreover, to Darius Codomannus, the opponent of Alexander. The kings of Persia are throughout alluded to in a manner which is fitted to suggest that the Persian empire had already passed away. Ezra and Nehemiah themselves are occasionally spoken of, not as contemporaries, but as vanished heroes of the venerable past (see, for example, Neh. xii. 26, 47). But the same data which forbid us to fix a date for Ezra-Nehemiah earlier than 350 B.C., manifestly also forbid the conclusion of Spinoza (*Tract. Theol. Polit.*, x. 28) who placed the work later than the Maccabees.

Credibility.—The doubts raised by Graf and others with reference to the historical value of the earlier portion of the work of the Chronicler do not extend to the Ezra-Nehemiah section. There is general concurrence in the conviction that the sources he had access to fully guarantee the trustworthiness of his narrative. A question has, indeed, been raised as to the measure of sagacity he has shown in his employment of some of the materials he had at his disposal, Bertheau and others believing (in opposition to Ewald) that he has inappropriately introduced into the narrative of Ezra iv. certain documents which really refer to the later period of Nehemiah.

The text of Ezra-Nehemiah has reached us in a somewhat impure state. Great caution requires to be exercised, especially as regards the numerals and proper names. Some help may be got from the LXX. translator, who has been faithfully literal "almost to unintelligibility."

Literature.—In addition to the works referred to under CHRONICLES, the following may be consulted:—Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* (1832) p. 18 *sq.*; Bertheau's admirable commentary in the *Exegetisches Handbuch* (1862); his article "Chronik" in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon*; Dillmann on "Chronik" in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*; Nagelsbach on "Ezra" in the same work; Keil, *Commentar* (Engl. tr. 1873); Schultz, in Lange's *Bibelwerk* (1876; Eng. tr. 1877); Rawlinson in the *Speaker's Commentary*, vol. iii. (J. S. BL.)

F was the sixth letter of the primitive Greek alphabet. It represented the sound of our W, *i.e.*, a soft labial. But that sound was unpleasant to the Greek ear, and it began to fall out of use at an early time in all parts of Hellas; it disappeared most completely in the Ionic and in the cognate Attic dialect; it survived longer in the Æolic and the Doric, and it is not improbable that the symbol F may have been written in these dialects after the sound it represented had perished. The grammarians in dealing with this extinct letter gave it the name "digamma" from the shape of the symbol, *i.e.*, a gamma (Γ) with a second horizontal stroke, and they added the name "Æolic" from a mistaken impression that it lingered longer in that dialect than in the Doric. It was from the Doric of Cumæ, as has been already said (see ALPHABET), that the Latins derived the symbols of their alphabet, and F with the others. But though the Latin language contained the sound *w*, it did not seem necessary to have a special symbol to distinguish it from the vowel *u*; and F was used to express quite a different sound, one which the Greek did not possess. This was probably the same sound which the letter still denotes with us—the hard labio-dental (to which V is the corresponding soft sound) produced by pressing the upper teeth on the lower lip, and then letting the breath escape laterally or through the interstices of the teeth—very much, as Quintilian says in his amusing description of the Latin sound (xii. 10, 29), which "pæne non humana voce, vel omnino non voce, potius inter discrimina dentium efflanda est." It was quite distinct from *ph*—a distinction which we have sacrificed; *ph* was a *p* followed by a slight breath, not quite so strong as in "upheave," but very similar; and it expressed in Latin the sound of the Greek φ. The Greeks found the Latin *f* a difficult sound—much as the Germans find the English *th*—and we find Cicero laughing at a Greek witness because he could not pronounce the first letter of "Fundanius," which he doubtless called "P-hundanius." The emperor Claudius has the credit of endeavouring to improve the Roman system of spelling by filling up of some of the defects of the alphabet. Thus, he proposed to use an inverted F (Ⅎ) to denote the corresponding soft consonant (V) which, as we have said above, had no special symbol in the Roman alphabet. Thus in inscriptions of his reign we find ⅎOⅎIMUS, IOⅎI, &c. But this improvement did not long survive its author.

FABER, BASIL (1520–1576), a German schoolmaster and theologian, was born at Sorau in Lower Lusatia in 1520. After studying at the university of Wittenberg, which at that time was under the direction of Melanchthon, he chose the profession of a schoolmaster, and became rector of the school at Nordhausen, whence he went successively to Tennstädt, Magdeburg, and Quedlinburg. His religious opinions led to his being removed from his office in the last-named place in 1570, but a short time afterwards he received and accepted an invitation to become master of the Räths-gymnasium at Erfurt, where he continued till his death in 1576. Faber was a strong Lutheran, and translated the first 25 chapters of Luther's commentary on Genesis, and in various other ways zealously endeavoured to promote the spread of Lutheran opinions. He was a contributor to the first four of the *Magdeburg Centuries*. He is, however, best known by his *Thesaurus Eruditionis Scholasticæ*, a work which for many years retained a high place in Germany as a scholastic manual. It was originally published in 1571, and the last edition, edited and improved by Leich, appeared in 1749.

FABER, CECILIA BÖHL VON (1797–1877), the great woman-novelist of Spain, better known by her masculine pseudonym of Fernan Caballero, was born at Morges, Canton de Vaud, in 1797, her parents being then on a tour through Switzerland. Her father, Johann Nikolas Böhl von Faber, the son of a Hamburg merchant, had removed early in life to Cadiz, prospered in business, professed the Catholic faith, and married Doña Francisca de Larrea, a member of the Spanish aristocracy. Cecilia received a considerable part of her education in Germany at Görslow near Schwerin, where her father had an estate; and here, besides other accomplishments, including a complete mastery of German and Spanish, she acquired a competent knowledge of Latin, English, French, and Italian. In 1813 she returned to Cadiz, and in the following year became the wife of Captain Planells, whom she accompanied to America, where she seems to have spent some years of married life. Not long after the death of her first husband, she was married to the Marques de Arco Hermoso, and in virtue of her exalted station frequently attended the court of Madrid, where she was much admired for her beauty, vivacity, and wit. In 1837, having, by the death of the marquis (1835), been again left a widow, she gave her hand to Señor de Arrom, a member of the bar. This union appears to have been productive of little happiness, and when her husband accepted an appointment as Spanish consul abroad, she decided to remain alone in Seville. It is to the trials and disappointments that came upon her in the later years of her life that the world is indebted for the fascinating works of this distinguished writer, who seems to have been driven to authorship less by any imperious literary instinct than by the necessity she felt for some anodyne against sorrow. Rarely does it happen that literary genius such as she possessed lies dormant for so long a time, unguessed by the world, hardly suspected even by its owner. As early as 1828, indeed, if not earlier, she had committed to writing, in the form of a novel, a tale of peasant life, which she had heard prosaically told under the olive trees at the village of Dos Hermanas, in the neighbourhood of Seville, but singularly enough, she had preferred to make use of the German language, and does not appear to have contemplated publication. Although Washington Irving, in the course of one of his visits to Spain, had seen and praised the manuscript, and had encouraged the writer to cultivate literature, and especially Spanish literature, as a serious pursuit, it was not till many years afterwards that this first effort, *La Familia de Alvareda*, was presented to the public; nor was it till after her fiftieth year had been passed that she appeared as an author at all, and even then only under an assumed name. Her first, and in some respects her best, publication, *La Gaviota* (The Sea-Gull), was originally printed in short daily instalments in the pages of a Madrid newspaper in 1849. It met with high appreciation in the capital, and was accordingly followed at brief intervals by *Elia*, *Clemencia*, *La Familia de Alvareda*, *Una en Otra*, *Simon Verde*, and other *Cuadros de costumbres populares* (pictures of popular life). Slowly but surely the works of the new writer found their way all over the peninsula, and gradually were translated into French and German, until within ten years she had achieved a European reputation. A collected edition of her works in 13 volumes was issued from the royal printing press at Madrid in 1859, and about the same time she received an appointment as governess to the royal children. From 1863 to 1868 she occupied rooms in the palace of the Alcazar,—