

EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA

reconstructing the history of the ANE, and also valuable dates and other information on secular Greek and Roman history. The *Eusebian Canons*, still printed in standard critical texts of the NT, were invented by Eusebius as a means of indicating parallel passages in the gospels. His use of this device shows that he clearly recognized—though it was not safe to state it explicitly in his period—that one cannot set up a detailed chronology of the period of Jesus' active ministry. He also produced an *Onomasticon*, a work on biblical place names, giving geographical locations of some 600 towns, historical sites, districts, mountains, and rivers, and connecting them with contemporary Roman place names. It is still of great importance to Palestinian archaeologists for the data it gives. In his *Onomasticon* and *Chronicle*, Eusebius was also attempting, at the theological level, to create the sense of a Christian space and time for Roman Palestine (Groh 1986).

In *Against Hierocles*, Eusebius argued that Jesus, rather than the pagan philosopher and miracle worker Apollonius of Tyana, had been the true *theios anēr* or divine man. In Origenist fashion, Eusebius asserted that Jesus was a man who was truly divine because his human soul possessed the full unfallen vision of God, and that his profound effect on other human beings demonstrated his divinity.

After years of neglect, Eusebius is now increasingly being recognized as a major Christian thinker, who gave a serious alternative to the Augustinian theology of history, and who furnished a fascinating example in his own forty-year career (290s–339) of Christianity's transition from a persecuted, nonmilitaristic minority to upholders of the combined ecclesiastical, governmental, and military establishment created by the 4th-century Christian emperors.

Bibliography

- Barnes, T. D. 1981. *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge, MA.
- Chesnut, G. F. 1975. The Pattern of the Past: Augustine's Debate with Eusebius and Sallust. Pp. 69–75 in *Our Common History as Christians: Essays in Honor of Albert C. Outler*, ed. J. Deschner; L. T. Howe; and K. Penzel. New York.
- . 1986. *The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius*. 2d ed., rev. and enlarged. Macon GA.
- Downey, G. 1965. The Perspective of the Early Church Historians. *GRBS* 6: 57–70.
- Drake, H. A. 1976. *In Praise of Constantine*. University of California Publications: Classical Studies 15. Berkeley.
- Grant, R. M. 1980. *Eusebius as Church Historian*. Oxford.
- Groh, D. E. 1986. The *Onomasticon* of Eusebius and the Rise of Christian Palestine. Pp. 23–31 in vol. 1 of *Studia Patristica XVIII: Papers of the Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford 1983*, ed. A. Livingstone. Kalamazoo.
- Jones, A. H. M. 1954. Notes on the Genuineness of the Constantinian Documents in Eusebius's Life of Constantine. *JEH* 5: 196–200.
- Laqueur, R. 1929. *Eusebius als Historiker seiner Zeit*. Berlin.
- Lawlor, H. J., and Oulton, J. E. L. 1927–28. Notes and commentary in their trans. of Eusebius of Caesarea, *The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine*. 2 vols. London.
- Momigliano, A. 1963. Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D. Pp. 79–99 in *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, ed. A. Momigliano. Oxford.

Mosshammer, A. A. 1979. *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition*. Lewisburg, PA.

Quasten, J. 1963–64. *Patrology*. [Pp. 309–45 of vol. 3 give a quite full bibliography of pre-1960 texts, translations, and studies.] Utrecht and Antwerp.

Sirinelli, J. 1961. *Les Vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée durant la période prénicéenne*. Dakar.

GLENN F. CHESNUT

EUTYCHUS (PERSON) [Gk *Eutuchos*]. A young boy who, while listening to Paul in Troas, went to sleep and fell from an upstairs window (Acts 20:9). The story indicates that he was “taken up dead” (not “as dead”). Paul is said to have “bent over him” and embraced him and then said, “Do not be alarmed, for his life is in him.” Whether or not the boy was actually dead is impossible to determine. Although the story is told as if he were dead, Paul's words, “his life is in him,” may be understood as implying he was not actually dead. However one may resolve this ambiguity, the story appears to be attributing to Paul the ability to bring the dead boy back to life as Elijah and Elisha did in a similar manner. Paul's actions resemble the OT incidents involving Elijah and Elisha stretching themselves out over children in order to bring life back to them (1 Kgs 17:21; 2 Kgs 4:34–35).

FRANK E. WHEELER

EVANGELIST. See MINISTRY IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

EVE (PERSON) [Heb *ḥawwā*]. Eve, the first woman, is an enigmatic figure. Apart from Genesis 2–4, she is mentioned very rarely in biblical material and yet she has played an important part in theological discussion and debate over gender roles in society throughout the post-biblical period (Pagels 1988). The origins of both the name and the figure have been the subject of wide-ranging scholarly debate.

A. The Name “Eve”

The woman in the garden of Eden story (Gen 2:4b–3:24) is given the name *ḥawwā*, “Eve,” in Gen 3:20. This verse sits awkwardly in the text and many scholars assume a different recension of the story is used here from that in Gen 2:23 where she is called *ʾiššā*, “woman.” Such a doublet could, however, arise from the oral tradition behind the narrative. The origin of the name *ḥawwā* is uncertain. In the story the woman is called *ḥawwā* because she is the “mother of all living (*ḥay*).” This suggests a derivation from the root *ḥyh*, “to live,” but no immediate connection can be sustained. J's etymology is based solely on a word-play. Note that the LXX translates *ḥawwā* by *zōē*, “life,” in 3:20. Evidence from Ugaritic and Phoenician suggest another ancient word “to live,” *ḥwy* from which *ḥawwā* could be derived. If this is the case, then the name itself is either borrowed or is an ancient traditional name.

The expression “mother of all living” has suggested to some a connection between Eve and various ANE mother goddesses. The Akkadian goddess Mami is called *bēlet kala*

B.
kēn
oftu
Ad
and
imp
pers
kēneg
respe
from
subm
super

ili, "mistress of all the gods," and *baniat awilūti*, "creatress of humanity" (*Atrahasis* 1. 188–260). Ugaritic texts refer to Asherah as *qnyt. ʾilm*, "creatress of the gods," and *mānqt. ʾilm*, "nurse of the gods," in her role as mother goddess. A Carthaginian devotional text (KAI 89) dated to the 3d or 2d century B.C.E. contains the word *hwt*, which could be related to Hebrew *hawwā*. It begins *rbt hwt ʾlt mlkt*. *hwt* could be the name of a female deity or an epithet of a goddess, possibly Asherah or Tannit. These two divine names can be identified as referring to the one figure. Of all the goddesses, she is most frequently given the titles *rbt*, "lady," and *ʾlt*, "goddess." If *hwt* is derived from a word for "life" or "to live" it is a fitting epithet for the mother goddess. These points suggest that the name given to the woman in Gen 3:20 could be a derivative of a title for the Canaanite mother goddess or at least an allusion to her.

Some scholars have pointed to the similarity of the name *hawwā* to the Aramaic word *ḥwyā*, "serpent." In early Aramaic the word for "serpent" appears to be *ḥwh*. They have proposed that *hawwā* was originally the name of an underworld goddess or that in an earlier version of Genesis 3 Eve and the serpent were identical. While this is conjectural, the possible connection of *hawwā* to a word for "serpent" should not be overlooked. There is some tentative evidence suggesting a connection between the mother goddess Asherah/Tannit and serpents although the exact nature of the connection remains obscure. Both are strongly associated with fertility themes.

From this discussion it could be suggested that the name *hawwā* in Gen 3:20 is meant to allude to the great goddess Asherah. The designation of Eve as the "mother of all living," the presence of the motif of fertility, and the associations with the serpent and sacred trees all have possible counterparts in mythic material in which Asherah is mentioned. If such an allusion is intended, then we should note that the circumstances of the Gen 2:4b–3:24 narrative are the exact reversal of what one might expect in a story about the mother goddess. Rather than productivity and fertility, the outcome in the story in Genesis is death, sterility, and hardship (Gen 3:14–19). Even the "mother of all living" is to suffer in childbirth. The interaction between Eve and the serpent, also a symbol of fertility, ultimately leads to death. The man's toil with the ground yields reward only at the price of pain and sweat. Thus Gen 2:4b–3:24 would seem to embrace a polemic against fertility themes of the Canaanite cult. This polemic, however, has been reworked by J so that now it forms part of the background of the story.

B. Theological Considerations

In Gen 2:20 it is stated that Eve is created to be an *ʿezer kēnegdō*, "a helper fit for him" (RSV). This expression has often been seen to indicate the subordination of Eve to Adam and hence generally of women to men in societal and family life. However, the word *ʿezer*, "helper," does not imply subordination. It can be used to refer to a superior person or even to God, e.g., Ps 146:5. The phrase *ʿezer kēnegdō* is best understood as meaning "a companion corresponding to him." The fact that Eve is created second from one of the man's ribs and that she is tempted and submits first have also been used to argue for either the superiority of men over women or of women over men.

EVI

The former position has been strongly supported historically in the traditions of Judaism (e.g., *Gen. Rab.* 18.2), Islam (Al-Baghawi, *Mishkat al-Masabih*), and Christianity. The only references to Eve in the NT, 2 Cor 11:3 and 1 Tim 2:11–15, both develop this line. The argument can be traced to the present day. The latter position, arguing for the superiority of women over men, has been voiced more strongly recently but it had its early proponents, e.g., in the Talmud (*Sanhedrin*, 39a). In either case the arguments depend more on the presuppositions of the interpreters than on what the text of Gen 2:4b–3:24 states explicitly. The text in its original form is concerned about the potential for intimacy in the divine-human relationship and in human relationships in light of the alienation that exists in the world. The subordination of Eve to her husband (Gen 3:16) clearly stands as one of the curses of a broken creation.

Bibliography

- Heller, J. 1958. Der Name Eva. *AcOr* 26: 636–56.
 Joines, K. R. 1974. *Serpent Symbolism in the Old Testament*. Haddonfield, N.J.
 Kikawada, I. M. 1972. Two Notes on Eve. *JBL* 91: 33–37.
 Pagels, E. 1988. *Adam, Eve and the Serpent*. London.
 Phipps, W. E. 1976. Adam's Rib: Bone of Contention. *TToday* 33: 263–73.
 Tribble, P. 1978. Pp. 72–143 in *God and Rhetoric of Sexuality*. Philadelphia.
 Wallace, H. N. 1985. *The Eden Narrative*. HSM 32. Atlanta.
 Williams, A. J. 1977. The Relationship of Genesis 3:20 to the Serpent. *ZAW* 89: 357–74.

HOWARD N. WALLACE

EVERLASTING GOD. See NAMES OF GOD IN THE OT.

EVI (PERSON) [Heb ʿēwī]. A king of the Midianites (Num 31:8; Josh 13:21). The root ʿwy means "to seek shelter, refuge" in Canaanite and Arabic, and produces the personal names ʿwy (Phoenician, Safaitic, and ancient Syriac), ʿwyʿbl (Punic), ʿwʿ (Ammonite), the tribal name ʿwym (Sabaic), and the place names ʿwm (Sabaic, the main temple of Maʿrib) and byt ʿwn (Heb). The name is therefore well attested in Semitic (Knauf 1988: 89), and need not be explained by Anatolian formatives (Mendenhall 1973: 167).

Historically, the five Midianite kings in Numbers 31 are difficult to deal with. Whereas Albright (1970) assumed that the Midianite war described in this chapter antedates the domestication of the camel (an observation which would now lead into the 3d millennium B.C.; Knauf 1988: 9–10), it is preferable to derive the Midianite "kings" from a list of places forming an itinerary through N Arabia and S Transjordan in the Persian period (Knauf 1988: 166–67). For the localization of Evi, one of the natural strongholds in the Petra area (Baʿjah or Umm al-Biyārah) is suggested.